



Continuation of Substance of Interview including description of the general nature of what was discussed: The examiner contacted applicant's Attorney because the claims as amended April 19th 2004, did not clearly set forth the limitations argued by applicant in the April 19th 2004 response, because correction of the "local" non-uniformities of the spatial distribution of the additional magnetic field produced by the magnetic field correcting unit was not clearly set forth. In the discussions with applicant's attorney numerous grammatical errors were found. The examiner offered to make an examiner's amendment to the claims to clarify the applicant's argued limitations clearly within applicant's claims, since the argued features are supported by applicant's original disclosure and the Japanese priority document of March 26th 1999. No new matter was added. The examiner was thanked for her assistance. The applicant was informed that a complete new set of drawings including all approved.